

**REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicant has amended claim 19 to further clarify the invention.

Claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willars et al. in view of Barany et al. and Curry et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Willars et al. discloses in a multi-layer telecommunications system which includes an application layer and a transport layer, differing transport technologies are interworked without terminating the application layer signaling or without involving a technology interworking in the control plane of the application layer. The application layer may be a radio network layer of a wireless telecommunication system. A transport layer interworking function is situated on an interface between two nodes of the radio access network. The interworking function can be located in a separate node which may be a node having both ATM and IP interfaces.

Barany et al. discloses a wireless network and serviced mobile station managing VOIP telephony calls by incorporating control information into VOIP datagrams. The control information includes an indication of the data rate of the VOIP payload of the VOIP datagram, the quality of the VOIP payload, requested data rates for subsequent VOIP datagrams, and whether the VOIP payload contains a "silent" VOIP payload.

Curry et al. discloses a localized wireless gateway system that provides wireless communication, and for at least interexchange communication, provides voice telephone access to a public packet data network, such as the internet. The wireless gateway system includes base station transceivers and a packet service gateway coupling the transceivers to the public packet data network. The packet service gateway compresses and decompresses voice frequency communication signals, and it sends and receives the compressed signals in packet form via the network. The packet service gateway also provides for signaling in the network to establish two-way voice communication sessions.

Regarding claims 1, 9, 14 and 19, Applicant submits that none of the cited references taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination in each of these claims of, *inter alia*, interpreting a directory number of a second mobile station as requested by a first mobile station and establishing a traffic connection between the second mobile station and a second BSS-IP using a prescribed protocol, or generating a ring-back tone using a prescribed protocol so that the first mobile station receives the ring-back tone, or stopping the generation of the ring-back tone using a prescribed protocol if the second mobile station responds, and establishing a call connection between the first mobile station and the second mobile station, or a system for interworking a RAN in an IP based core network that includes a wireless call agent to conduct call connection and routing functions by controlling all gateways accommodated in the IP based core network, and a trunk

gateway configured to conduct voice traffic matching functions between the IP based core network and a wire-based network, and to provide service functions unique to voice communication, or a wireless call agent coupled between the first and second BSS-IP, wherein the first mobile station is configured to establish a traffic connection between the first mobile station and the first BSS-IP using a prescribed protocol, wherein the second BSS-IP is configured to establish a traffic connection using a prescribed protocol between the second mobile station and a second BSS-IP based on a directory number of the second mobile station as requested by the first mobile station, and wherein a call connection is established between the first mobile station and the second mobile station using the wireless call agent in accordance with the established traffic connections between each mobile station and BSS-IP.

The Examiner fails to point out any specific portions of any of the cited references that disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Willars et al. merely relates to differing transport technologies and Berany et al. is directed to managing VOIP telephone calls by incorporating control information into VOIP datagrams. None of these references disclose or suggest interpreting a directory number, stopping the generation of a ring-back tone if the second mobile station responds, and establishing a call connection between the first mobile station and the second mobile station, or a wireless call agent to conduct call connection and routing functions by controlling all gateways accommodated in the IP based core network, or the wireless call agent being used to establish a call connection between the first

mobile station and the second mobile station in accordance with established traffic connections between each mobile station and a BSS-IP.

The Examiner admits that Willars et al. and Barany et al. fail to disclose or suggest interpreting of a DN and generation and stopping of ring-back tones, but asserts that Curry discloses these limitations at cols. 16, lines 6-67, 17-23. However, these eight columns of disclosure (nearly half of the Curry et al. patent), merely disclose further details regarding the operation of the wireless gateway system as well as call processing examples, as well as details regarding the registration and validation of roaming wireless telephones that is under the control of the access manager. These portions of Curry et al. do not disclose or suggest interpreting a directory number of a second mobile station and establishing a traffic connection between the second mobile station and a second BSS-IP using a prescribed protocol or stopping the generation of the ring-back tone using a prescribed protocol if the second mobile station responds and establishing a call connection between the first mobile station and the second mobiles station, as recited in the claims of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out specific portions of a cited reference that is asserted as disclosing each and every limitation in the claims of the present application, as opposed to citing nearly half the patent application in the hope that Applicant's claim limitations are contained in these portions of the cited reference.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a system for interworking a RAN in an IP based core network that includes protocols for establishing a unified IP based communication network by matching the RAN and the core network, and for signal connection and traffic transmission connection required for the matching of the two networks, where the protocols include an MTP-3 user adaptation layer, a stream control transmission protocol, a logical loop control, a media gateway control protocol, a user datagram protocol, an internet protocol, and a media access control, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner asserts that Willars et al. disclose these limitations in Figures 1, 6B, 9A and paragraphs 102 and 103, in that Berany discloses matching signal protocols at Figures 3 and 5, columns 9-12, col. 13, lines 10-31. However, these portions of these cited references do not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. If the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to specifically point out where in each cited reference each and every limitation in Applicant's claims is disclosed or suggested.

Regarding claims 2-8, 9-13, 15-18 and 19-22, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reason noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

Serial No. **10/026,779**

Docket No. **SI-0015**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

each of claims 1-22 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing Amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/026,779**

Docket No. **SI-0015**

Amdt. dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

**Date: January 12, 2006**

\\fk4\Documents\2029\2029-007\77802.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**